

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 26, 2007. Claims 36 and 38-45 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 32 and 33 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 22, 24, 25, 31, and 56-72 are presented for examination, of which Claims 22, 24, 31, 56, and 57 are in independent form. Claims 22, 24, 31, 56, and 57 have been amended as discussed below. Claims 58-72 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action re-asserts the Restriction Requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 requiring restriction of the application from the previous Office Action dated February 8, 2007, of which Applicant submitted a response selecting Group I on May 3, 2007. Per the Examiner's request, Applicant hereby re-affirms this election.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claim 33 includes allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Claim 31 has been amended to include the subject matter formerly recited in Claims 32 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31 is allowable.

The Office Action states that Claims 22, 24, 25, 31, 32, 56, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,163,771 (*Walker et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028481 (*Flitcroft et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115126 (*Pitroda*).

Cancellation of Claims 32 and 33 renders the rejection of Claim 32 and the objection to Claim 33 moot. Applicants have amended the remaining independent Claims 22, 24, 56, and 57 to include substantially the same features as Claim 31 discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 22, 24, 31, 56, and 57 are patentable over the cited art of record, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
FCHS_WS 1703310_3